

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008. Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the thorough explanation of the rejections set forth in the Office Action.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, the Specification was objected to. Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128).

II. Summary of Applicants' Amendments

The present Response amends Claims 26, 63, and 68, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73. Reconsideration of the application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Objections to the Specification

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, the Specification was objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for first business logic component and second business logic component. The Specification discusses the use of enterprise java beans (see paragraph [0008]). As is known to one of ordinary skill in the art, "an enterprise bean is a server-side *component* that encapsulates the *business logic* of an application." See *What is an Enterprise Bean* at <http://java.sun.com/javaee/5/docs/tutorial/doc/bnblt.html>. Thus, because the Specification discusses the use of enterprise java beans, it is respectfully submitted that the Specification provides proper support for first business logic component and second business logic component. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, Claims 24-29, 63-64, and 68-73 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Underwood (U.S. Patent No. 6,609,128 B1).

Claim 24

Claim 24 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 24 defines:

24. *(Currently Amended) A method for generating a unified user profile for providing to a user or application transparent access to a personalization database and an external user database, said method comprising the steps of:*

- (a) obtaining a first business logic component adapted to work through a personalization server to access said personalization database, wherein said first business logic component provides a transparent interface to a user or application through which implicit and explicit properties can be retrieved from and updated in the personalization database, and further wherein the access is carried out independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the personalization database;*
- (b) generating a unified user profile by creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component such that said implicit and explicit properties can further be transparently retrieved from and updated in an external user database independent of any knowledge of the user or application of the naming convention of data in the external user database;*
- (c) wherein the first business logic component and the second business logic component allow the user or application to access data in the personalization database and the external user database independent of any knowledge of the data's location;*
- (d) wherein the extended first business logic component uses a property set, said property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of said data in said personalization database such that the property set can differentiate properties with a single name; and further wherein said implicit and explicit properties comprise getter and setter properties; and*
- (e) obtaining a security realm adapted to allow authentication of data in said personalization database and said external user database.*

Claim 24 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment as a method for generating a unified user profile for providing to a user or application transparent access to a

personalization database and an external user database, comprising wherein the extended first business logic component uses a property set, said property set adapted to give namespace qualifications to implicit and explicit properties of said data in said personalization database such that the property set can differentiate properties with a single name. Applicants respectfully submit that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

In the Office Action mailed January 25, 2008, Underwood was submitted as disclosing generating a unified user profile by creating a second business logic component to extend the first business logic component. In part, the Office Action stated that "the claimed limitation **business logic component** cannot be considered as being equivalent to a class in programming language as argued by applicant. Applicants respectfully disagree. As discussed in the Objections to the Specification section, the Specification discusses the use of enterprise java beans, which provides proper antecedent basis for first business logic component and second business logic component. The Specification further discloses that a base user enterprise java bean (first business logic component) is a Java class (see paragraph [0028]). Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the first business logic component is a Java class that can be extended by a second Java class.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicants respectfully submit that the embodiment defined by Claim 24 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 63 and 68

For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 24, Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 63 and 68, as amended, are likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73

Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 25-29, 64, and 69-73 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: Apr. 25, 2008

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800